Please amend claim 58 as follows:

58. (Once Amended)The process according to claim ~~56~~, wherein with a view to the preparatory treatment the aluminum surface is subjected to a cleansing process.

Please amend claim 59 as follows:

59. (Once Amended) The process according to claim ~~58~~, wherein the cleansing process includes at least one of a dry-etching process, a wet-etching process or a laser treatment of the aluminum surface.

Please amend claim 62 as follows:

62. (Once Amended) The process according to claim ~~45~~, wherein a vibrational loading of the wire conductor brought about by ultrasound takes place in a plane substantially parallel to the terminal area and transverse to the longitudinal axis of the wire conductor.

REMARKS

Claims 40 through 66 and 78 are in the case and presented for consideration. By this amendment, Applicant as revised in independent claim 40 and Applicant requests reconsideration of all of the claims.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure. Applicant has now amended the disclosure to address the problems noted but Examiner. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for pointing out this oversight.

47

The Examiner has rejected claims 40 – 51,53,55, 62,63 and 66 as being obvious in view of Japanese patent no. 62-008313. The Examiner takes the position that this reference teaches a magnetic head wherein a coil having wire terminals is bonded to a flat substrate having a conductor pattern thereon.

As will be evident from Fig. 1 of the respective Japanese patent no. 62-008313, the part of the substrate serving for an arrangement of the terminals of the coil for subsequent connection with a conductor pattern of a circuit board (Fig. 4) is not an integral part of the actual coil substrate serving for the formation of the coil by arrangement of coil wire windings on the surface plane of the coil substrate. Beyond that, the non-integral structure of the "connecting part" of the substrate compared with the actual coil substrate leads to an arrangement of the coil and terminals perpendicular to at least a part of the surface plane of the coil substrate. This results in an entirely bulky structure of the coil/printed board arrangement according to Noriyuki.

The inventive method according to the revised claim 40 offers the possibility to provide for an entirely flat formation of a coil/chip arrangement forming a transponder unit arranged on a substrate. This is achieved by an arrangement of the part of the wire conductor serving for connection with the terminal areas of the chip unit on the coil substrate such that the wire conductor, for being connected, extends in parallel to the surface plane of the windings of the wire coil. This feature is highlighted in claim 40 and provides significant advantages.

The Japanese patent no. 62-008313 fails to suggest the method and fails to appreciate the advantages attained according to the invention. The application of the inventive method

B

provides for an arrangement of a transponder unit having a coil and a chip unit, both being positioned on the actual coil substrate and not on any substrate extension, which substrate extension is not necessary to form the coil.

Likewise, none of the other prior art documents cited provides a teaching or a suggestion to the person of ordinary skill in the art to come to the inventive method. As for Bain, Hohns, Swiggett, Hasegawa and Yamada, Applicant acknowledges the stated difference as noted by the Examiner, a significant difference compared to the method which is the subject matter of claim 40. The aforementioned documents merely show a method for providing insulating plates or boards with conductors and for connecting conductors arranged on insulating plates or boards with any electronic components. The prior art as a whole, including the aforementioned documents, fails to teach or suggest a method for connecting terminals of a coil formed onto the surface plane of a coil substrate with terminal areas of a chip unit positioned on the same coil substrate, the arrangement of the terminals of the coil being carried out in the manner claimed by claim 40.

Even between the method as described by Gustafson and the inventive method the very difference lies in the fact that the coil is part of the coil/chip arrangement of Gustafson is not formed onto the surface of a substrate but is formed independent of the substrate 1 (Fig. 1) which serves for the arrangement of the chip 13. Therefore there is no coil substrate in the sense of claim 40 which serves for an arrangement of the coil but merely a substrate supplemented to the coil structure serving for the connection of the coil terminals 23, 24 with the chip 13. Even in case, as disclosed in column 2, starting at line 11, the coil 2 supplemented

B

by the printed circuit 1 is arranged onto a plastic layer in order to form a credit card 3 (Fig. 1). This differs from the inventive method as it is not provided to arrange a coil and a chip unit on one and the same substrate but to arrange a coil on the substrate layer 3 and to arrange a chip unit on another substrate 1 ("printed circuit').

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider the rejections in view of the revised claims the discussion above.

Respectfully submitted
for Applicant,

By:_____
John James McGlew
Registration No. 31,903
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

JJM:jj
59276.10

DATED: November 19, 1999
SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-0827
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-0410.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AS EXPRESS MAIL IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231, NO.: EL336198820US

McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.
SCARBOROUGH STATION, SCARBOROUGH, NY 10510-0827

BY:_____ DATE: November 19, 1999

B